they sftpposing^t to beingenerable and incorrupti
ble. Which same Pliny, as, upon the grounds of
th£ Stoical Atheism^ he maintained agkifrst the
AniEbdnliandrians and Democritics, the worJd?s
eternity and incorruptibility; so did he likewise,
in: way of opposition to that *dirapia KOCF^V,* that iiifi^-
riity of ;worlds—of their's, assert, that there was
- feat oftfe world, and that finite. In like[1] taanner
We r^ad Concerning that famous Stoic, BPelhi^
WhPm Laertius affirms to have denied the wcirfd
to be an animal (whieh^ according to the language
and setise of thos6 times! Was all one a!s to deny a
GotTf ;^tHat he *also* maintained, contrary td the? r^
Mfell d'octrine of the Stoics, the world's atarte^fetet[1]-
nity and incorruptibility; Philo, in his treatiste
<7f6pl *dtyQaptfMG Kocrfjov,* or the Incorruptibility of the
World,-^testifying the same of him.

*

Nevertheless it seems, that some tif these SfoicaA Atheists did also agree with the generality olf tlfe other Stoical Tlieistsi in supposing a succefesivfe Ihfinilf[1] of worlds generated and cbrmptedj by i*^a[L] son of intervening periodical conflagrations; though all dispensed by such a stupid and senseless nature, as governs plants and trees. For thus much we gather from those words of Seneca l)efore cife^ where, describing this Atheistical hypothe&ils, Be fcelts uSj that though

the world were a plant, tMt fe, ^overnied by a vegetative or plastic matiire, without any animality, yet notwithstanding, " afc initio ejus usque ad exitum," &c; it had both a beginning, and will have an end ; ,and from its begih[L] riinig to its end, all was dispensed by a kind of re-giilar liaw, even its successive conflagrations tooi as wiell as those inundations or deluges, which have sometimes happened. Which yet they u|i-